From: Madigan, Andrea [Madigan.Andrea@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/12/2016 8:06:03 PM
To: Trulove, Whitney [Trulove.Whitney@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Superfund Alternative Approach Guidance

I'm not in the office today. I'll get with you on Tuesday. Have a great weekend Andrea

From: Trulove, Whitney
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 11:10:09 AM
To: Thomas, Deb
Cc: Smith, Paula; Madigan, Andrea; Cirian, Mike; Russo, Rebecca; Hestmark, Martin; Bohan, Suzanne
Subject: RE: Superfund Alternative Approach Guidance

Yes, I am covering for Rebecca today and next week.

Andrea, if you are here today give me a call to discuss process. Otherwise, we will chat on Tuesday. I'm at 312-6099.

Thanks – Whitney

Whitney Trulove
EPA Region 8, Denver
Office of Communications & Public Involvement
Phone: 303-312-6099

From: Thomas, Deb
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 10:59 AM
To: Trulove, Whitney <Trulove.Whitney@epa.gov>
Cc: Smith, Paula <Smith.Paula@epa.gov>; Madigan, Andrea <Madigan.Andrea@epa.gov>; Cirian, Mike <Cirian.Mike@epa.gov>; Russo, Rebecca <Russo.Rebecca@epa.gov>; Hestmark, Martin <Hestmark.Martin@epa.gov>; Bohan, Suzanne <bohan.suzanne@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Superfund Alternative Approach Guidance

Whitney,
Are you covering for Rebecca while she is out? If so, can you take the lead in making sure we have a timely response to the Q's below? Andrea would be a good person to start with.

Deb

From: Laslovich, Dylan (Tester) [mailto:Dylan_Laslovich@tester.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 10:31 AM
To: Russo, Rebecca <Russo.Rebecca@epa.gov>; Nylund, Erik (Tester) <Erik_Nylund@tester.senate.gov>; Campbell, Chad (Tester) <Chad_Campbell@tester.senate.gov>; DiLuccia, Janelle (Tester) <Janelle_DiLuccia@tester.senate.gov>; Swanson, Dayna (Tester) <Dayna_Swanson@tester.senate.gov>
Cc: Thomas, Deb <thomas.debrah@epa.gov>; Madigan, Andrea <Madigan.Andrea@epa.gov>; Cirian, Mike <Cirian.Mike@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Superfund Alternative Approach Guidance

Hey all:

My colleague Chad Campbell spoke with community leaders and the below questions came out of that. This should also help give everyone context of what we're hearing on the ground. I believe the Agency had told some local residents that the alternative approach is faster which is part of the reason they are so interested in it. From what I gather, that's a tough question to answer as there are a lot of variables. We covered much of this on the call but it would be helpful to get responses to the below so we can help disseminate the information.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

1. Does the CFAC site qualify for the Superfund alternative approach?
2. If so, is the Alternative Approach a faster and better method than the traditional NPL/Superfund approach?
3. What are the advantages of the Alternative approach?
4. What are the drawbacks of the Alternative approach?
5. Who makes the decision as to which approach is used? Is there public comment/input on this approach?
6. If the alternative approach is selected and Glencore/CFAC "walks away" after testing is completed, what happens? Does EPA than have to start the NPL process all over or does it get listed and Superfund procedures started?
7. We were led to believe that the site was already listed on the NPL – please provide clarification on the process and where it currently stands?

From: Russo, Rebecca [mailto:Russo.Rebecca@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 11:56 AM
To: Laslovich, Dylan (Tester); Nylund, Erik (Tester); Campbell, Chad (Tester); DiLuccia, Janelle (Tester); Swanson, Dayna (Tester)
Cc: Thomas, Deb; Madigan, Andrea; Cirian, Mike
Subject: Superfund Alternative Approach Guidance

Hi all,
Please find attached a copy of the Superfund Alternative Approach Guidance we discussed Thursday.

Please let me know if you have any questions.
Rebecca

Rebecca A. Russo
Region 8 Congressional and Intergovernmental Liaison
Office: 303-312-6757
Cell: 303-204-1930